



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

<b>Applicant</b>	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority	<b>County</b>	Merced
<b>Project Title</b>	Los Banos Creek Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring Program	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 304,420.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal provides baseline information and project monitoring to document benefits and provide operation thresholds.

### **Evaluation Summary:**

<b>Scoring Criterion</b>	<b>Score</b>
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	8
Budget	5
Schedule	4
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>35</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The applicant adopted a Groundwater Management Plan in 2008. The plan and proof of adoption is provided.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed and well documented. The proposal is to construct three stream gauging sites, install water level transducers, a weather station and modify a website. The applicant does a thorough job of addressing the long term need and merit of the project. The applicant demonstrates collaboration with neighboring districts, growers and public outreach. The applicant sufficiently addresses the ongoing use and financing of the project.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is addressed and but not thoroughly the documented. The work plan provides appropriate tasks and describes them in sufficient detail. The applicant does a good job of addressing environmental compliance. The grant proposal only states that access to private property will be requested from the property owners during the grant review process, but there are no assurances that it will be given. Deliverables for each task are unclear and grant administration (reimbursement requests) is not addressed.
- **Budget:** The criterion is fully addressed and very well documented. The applicant provides a construction cost estimate, equipment estimates, fully explains travel, and District Contribution.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is addressed but not thoroughly documented. The schedule appears to be appropriate for the amount of work proposed and the time allotted to collect, analyze, and report the data. The applicant discusses common delays and the plan to deal with them. However, the applicant does not provide appropriate detailed descriptions of how the schedule was derived.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed and documented. The applicant provides qualifications of the project team and technical review committee and addresses standards for construction and sampling.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion was not fully addressed or thoroughly documented. The applicant provides a brief explanation of grant projects and states that projects were completed on time and within budget. The statements and documentation provided by the applicant do not completely fulfill the request to show high quality work, along with experience managing funds.